APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,593	10/21/1999	LEONARD CORNING LAHEY	B09-99-028	5731

7590 12/23/2003	EXAMINER

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DR.
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA   90212

EXAMINER
BOYCE, ANDRE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the c ver sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 September 2003_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) _7-9,12,20-22,25,33-35 and 38_ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-6,13-15,17-19,26-28,30-32 and 39_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _3,10,11,16,23,24,29,36 and 37_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.   6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Final office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed September

26, 2003. Claims 7, 12, 20, 25, 33, and 38 have been amended. Claims 1-39 are

pending.

2.   Applicant's arguments filed September 26, 2003 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 13-15, 18, 19, 26-28, 31, 32, and 39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yosefi (USPN 5,649,220), in view of Hsu

et al (USPN 5,581,691).

As per claim 1, Yosefi discloses a workflow management method for creating

and delivering output material (artwork design and production system, see Figure 3),

comprising generating a customer record (job ticket record provided by the artwork

designer who serves as the customer to the production shop, see column 7, lines

38-42) to include fields specifying at least one product (job number), customer

preferences (pages and size), and a selected delivery option indicating a method to

deliver generated output material (i.e., secondary menu 132 indicating the types of

devices from which the user can select to perform the desired operations including

plotter 1 & 2 and proofer 1 & 2, see column 8, lines 10-14 and figure 5) on the

product specified in the customer record, adding a job record (job ticket record)

including a status field to a job status table for the customer record (status report

managed by workflow manager 114, see column 11, lines 47-51), invoking a first

worker if the selected job has a first status, generating, with the first worker, output

material from processing the product and customer preference fields in the customer

record for the selected job (i.e., first specific worker performs respective operations

according to workflow of job ticket record, see column 8, lines 1-6), invoking a

second worker if the selected job has the second status, determining, with the

second worker, a selected one of a plurality of delivery options from the customer

record for the selected job (second specific worker next in workflow of job ticket

record, which would be the production shop workers), and transmitting the output

material via the determined delivery option to the customer specified in the customer

record (i.e., the production shop returns the database record and the newly created

output data file to the artwork designer/customer, based upon the output data file,

such as layout 21 or image 24, in the record of the job ticket database, column 9,

lines 16-18 and lines 39-47). Yosefi does not disclose setting the job record to a

first status, processing a selected job, and setting the status for the selected job to a

second status after generating the output material with the first worker. Hsu et al

disclose a history database 116, which is a log record database that can be

inspected to determine the current status of any ongoing workflow (see column 4,

lines 39-43). Both Yosefi and Hsu et al are concerned with the effective

management of workflows, therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a database in

Yosefi, as seen in Hsu et al, as an efficient means of monitoring the current status of

the job ticket record.

As per claim 2, Yosefi discloses accessing at least one content file (blocks 125)

by processing a database table (workflow database 123) using values in the

customer record associated with the job, and generating the content of each file into

the output material (the workflow unit 116 then produces the initial workflow based

on the values and the workflow manager 114 stores the workflow in a workflow

database 123 (i.e., table) according to blocks 125 (i.e., content files). As a result,

workflow manager 114 allows the users to perform operations according to the

blocks 125 of the workflow; column 7, lines 48-59 and column 8, lines 1-3).

As per claim 5, Yosefi does not disclose determining with the first and second

workers, whether an error occurred while processing the job, setting the status in the

job status table for the selected job to an error status, invoking an error worker if the

job has the error status, performing error recovery with the error worker, and setting

the status of the job to the first and second status after recovery. Hsu et al disclose

determining whether an error occurred while processing the job (exception, see

column 7, lines 8-11), invoking an error worker if the job has the error status

(compensation routine, see column 7, lines 8-11), performing error recovery with the

error worker, and setting the status of the job to the first or second status after

recovery (see column 7, lines 12-20). Both Yosefi and Hsu et al are concerned with

the effective management of workflows, therefore it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include

determining whether an error occurred and performing error recovery in Yosefi, as

seen in Hsu et al, as an efficient means of processing errors occurred during the

workflow of the job ticket record.

As per claim 6, Yosefi discloses a supervisor program (workflow manager 114)

that polls the job status table, performs the steps of invoking the first and second

workers, and processes every record in the job status table when performing the

polling operation (i.e., mark the display of the workflow to indicate which operations

have already been performed and which are current, thus polling the status, see

column 8, lines 39-43).

As per claim 13, Yosefi discloses multiple workers each associated with one

input status and at least one output status (i.e., multiple users performing their

respective operations listed in the workflow, see column 8, lines 1-3), wherein the

status of the job is updated to one associated output status after one worker

completes processing the job, wherein the output status for one worker is the input

status associated with one other worker and wherein the definition of input and

output statuses for workers defines the workflow of the job (i.e., status is determined

by workflow manager 114 as being complete or current, thus determining the

workflow, see column 8, lines 39-43).

Claims (14, 15, 18, 19, and 26) and (27, 28, 31, 32, and 39) are rejected based

upon the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 13, since they are the system and article

of manufacture claims, respectively, corresponding to the method claims.

5.   Claims 4, 17, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Yosefi (USPN 5,649,220), in view of Hsu et al (USPN 5,581,691), in further

view of Milsted et al (USPN 6,345,256)

As per claim 4, Yosefi does not discloses the first status associated with the first

worker and the second status associated with the second worker, wherein the first

and second workers queries the job status table to access all jobs having the

associated status. Hsu et al disclose the first status being associated with the first

worker and the second status being associated with the second worker. The

resource resolution function ID 236 (see column 15, 50-54), points directly to the

resource (worker) doing the step. Milsted et al disclose the work flow manager 154,

using application programming interfaces (APIs) to perform status queries (see

column 51, lines 20-24 and 44). Yosefi and Milsted are concerned with the effective

management of workflows, therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the first and

second workers to query the status table to access all associated jobs, in the Yosefi,

as seen in the Milsted et al, thus dividing the status querying function between

several resources, thereby improving the efficiency of the method.

Claims 17 and 30 are rejected based upon the rejections of claim 4, since they

are the system and article of manufacture claims, respectively, corresponding to the

method claim.

Response to Arguments

6.   In the Remarks, with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 27, Applicant

argues that Yosefi does not teach or suggest a customer record including fields

specifying a product, customer preferences and a delivery option indicating a

method to deliver the output, where the output material is transmitted to the

customer via the delivery option. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits

that Yosefi teaches a customer job ticket record (column 7, lines 38-42), including

customer preferences (pages and size). As seen in the Yosefi system the artwork

designer acts as the customer of the production shop and provides customer

information (column 7, lines 38-42). Further, Yosefi discloses a secondary menu

132 indicating the types of devices from which the user can select to perform the

desired operations including plotter 1 & 2 and proofer 1 & 2 (column 8, lines 10-14

and figure 5). Lastly, Yosefi discloses the workflow manager 114 storing the names

of output data files 127, such as layout 21 or image 24, in the job ticket record

(column 9, lines 16-18) and the production shop transmitting the database record

and the newly created output data file to the artwork designer/customer (column 9,

lines 39-47).

Applicant also argues that Yosefi does not teach or suggest a first worker invoked if the job has the first status and generating output material from processing the product and customer preference fields in a customer record for the selected job, or a second worker invoked if the job has the second status and determining from the customer record a delivery option and transmitting the output material via the determined delivery option. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Yosefi discloses the workers and users performing their respective operations via the workflow manager 114, which provides the workers with a selection of devices with which to operate (column 8, lines 1-6). With respect to Applicant's invention, the artwork designer would equate to the first worker and the customer of the production workers, whom equates to the second worker.

With respect to claims 2, 15, and 28, Applicant argues that Yosefi does not teach or suggest accessing a content file by processing a database table using values in a customer record associated with the job. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Yosefi discloses the desired workflow to be followed determined via the workflow definition unit 116 based upon information (i.e., values) stored in the customer record (column 7, lines 41-47) of the database. The workflow unit 116 then produces the initial workflow based on the values and the workflow manager 114 stores the workflow in a workflow database 123 (i.e., table) according to blocks 125 (i.e., content files). As a result, workflow manager 114 allows the users to perform operations according to the blocks 125 of the workflow (column 7, lines 48-59 and column 8, lines 1-3).

With respect to claims 5, 18, and 31, Applicant argues that Hsu does not teach or disclose setting the status of the selected job to one of the first or second statuses after the error recovery operation. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Hsu discloses the chain of steps already executed in the flow determined from the log records (column 7, lines 17-19). As a result, the system will indeed return to where the workflow was interrupted, once the compensation routine has cleaned up the workflow.

Allowable Subject Matter

7.   Claims 7-9, 12, 20-22, 25, 33-35, and 38 are allowed.

8.   Claims 3, 10, 11, 16, 23, 24, 29, 36 and 37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and

any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing

date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply

expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (703) 305-

1867. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-

9326.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)

308-1113.

adb

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600